



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,837	08/30/2001	Sang O. Park	K-0318	6861

34610 7590 08/08/2006

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/941,837

Applicant(s)

PARK, SANG O.

Examiner

Michael Van Handel

Art Unit

2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 7/11/2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Attached. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-11 and 13-31.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Attached.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


CHRIS KELLEY

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The applicant amended claim 1 with subject matter from claims that were not dependent on claim 1. The applicant amended claim 5 with subject matter from claims that were not dependent on claim 5. The applicant amended claim 11 with subject matter from claims that were not dependent on claim 11. The applicant amended claim 21 with subject matter from claims that were not dependent on claim 21. The applicant amended claim 25 with subject matter that was not included in claims dependent on claim 25, i.e. uniform address locator. Furthermore, the amendments raise new issues to be considered with respect to the claims that depend from the above-mentioned independent claims. Thus, new issues are presented in the current amendment, which would require additional consideration and/or searching.

Continuation of 11.

Regarding claim 16, the applicant argues that the combination of Kikinis and Alba et al. does not teach the limitations of the claim as currently written. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant states "Alba clearly does not relate to changing a shape or color of a cursor when the address of the Internet Web site exists regarding an item within the at least one interactive region." Kikinis discloses linking URLs with objects in TV presentations. Kikinis further discloses enhancing the image related to the URL with a special color, a halo, or an outline. When the viewer selects such images, the linked URL is invoked, which leads to a WEB location providing information related to the image (col. 5, l. 17-26). Kikinis further discloses selecting such images by manipulating a cursor to touch the region that has the associated URL and actuating a pressing a button on a remote (col. 7, l. 57-65). Thus, Kikinis clearly discloses enhancing a region of a TV presentation to indicate to a user that additional information corresponding to that region is available. Kikinis does not disclose changing a shape or color of a cursor when the cursor is positioned within the at least one interactive region. Alba et al. discloses changing the shape of a pointer/cursor to indicate to a user that alternate or additional information is available. Alba et al. further discloses that the shape of the pointer/cursor is changed depending on the screen location of the pointer/cursor (p. 6, paragraph 93 & Figs. 10A, 10B). Alba et al. further describes a need to facilitate easy access to a wide range of functionality through the combination of a limited number of user interactions (p. 1, paragraph 7). Thus, the examiner maintains that the teachings of Alba et al. sufficiently remedies the deficiencies of Kikinis and that Alba et al. states clear motivation for such a combination.